



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,135	09/29/2003	Michael J. Brookman	30552/39676A	5725
4743	7590	11/03/2005	EXAMINER	
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606			LEWIS, AARON J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3743

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,135	BROOKMAN, MICHAEL J.	
	Examiner AARON J. LEWIS	Art Unit 3743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/27/2005 (RCE).
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/27/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,3,4,6-10,13,15,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartels & Rieger (DE 3512644A1) in view of Hubner ('518) and Wilcox or Mucha (DE19503027).

The differences between Bartels & Rieger and claim 1 are means adapted to move said ambient air into said filter system, through said filter medium in said filter system and thence into operative relationship with a user of the apparatus and a switch associated with the means to move and coupled to the valve assembly adapted to

control energization of the moving means in conjunction with operation of the valve assembly.

Hubner, in a breathing apparatus, teaches means (1,4-6) adapted to move said ambient air into said filter system, through said filter medium in said filter system and thence into operative relationship with a user of the apparatus for the purpose of overcoming fluid flow resistance of the filter medium thereby relieving a user from having to expend an inordinate amount of energy in an effort to draw breathable air through the filter medium (col.7, lines 25-32).

It would have been obvious to modify the breathing apparatus of Bartels & Rieger to include a means to move ambient air through the filter medium because it would have overcome the fluid flow resistance of the filter medium thereby relieving a user from having to expend an inordinate amount of energy in an effort to draw breathable air through the filter medium as taught by Hubner.

Wilcox, in breathing apparatus, teaches a switch associated with the means to move and coupled to the valve assembly adapted to control energization of the moving means in conjunction with operation of the valve assembly for the purpose of enabling a wearer to switch modes of operation when the operator determines that ambient air contains low oxygen or dangerous non-filterable gases (see page 1, col.2 under the heading "OPERATION"). The switch in Wilcox eliminates the need to manually manipulate both the valve and the blower motor in order to change modes of operation.

It would have been obvious to modify the valve assembly of Bartels & Rieger to include a switch to enable a wearer to change modes of operation because it would

have eliminated the need to manually manipulate both the valve and the blower motor in order to change modes as taught by Wilcox. To the extent, if any, that Wilcox may not teach the movement of the valve in combination with adjustment of a blower by the single switch, resort is had to Mucha, in a breathing apparatus, which teaches both the movement of a changeover valve and adjustment of a blower by a single controller device.

As to claims 3,10, the face mask (see abstract) of Bartels & Rieger is adapted to tightly fit a wearer inasmuch as the breathing apparatus is intended for use in a noxious environment (i.e. used by firefighters).

As to claims 4,13, Bartels & Rieger (see figure) illustrates a first conduit means between said tank (11) and said face mask (i.e. at the terminal end of conduit 20), second conduit means between said filter/decontamination means (21) and said face mask, and valving means (19) operatively associated with said conduit means adapted to control the flow of cleaned air from said filter/decontamination means (21) or air from said tank (11) to said user. That is, the conduit extending between the tank and valve (19) constitutes a first conduit means while the conduit extending between filter (21) and valve (19) constitutes a second conduit means.

As to claims 6,15, Bartels & Rieger as modified by Hubner and Wilcox or Mucha as discussed above with respect to claim 1 also teaches a one-way exhaust valve (#3 of Mucha) operatively associated with the face mask.

As to claim 7, Wilcox teaches the switch being user actuatable.

As to claims 8,16, Wilcox (see page 1, col.2 under the heading "OPERATION") and Mucha (see abstract) teach the switch being coupled to the valve assembly to energize the moving means when the valve assembly is set to control the flow of cleaned air from the filter system and to de-energize the moving means when the valve assembly is set to control pressurized air from the pressure tank.

Claim 9 is substantially equivalent in scope to claim 1 and is included in Bartels & Rieger in view of Hubner and Wilcox or Mucha for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

4. Claims 2,11,12,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartels & Rieger in view of Hubner and Wilcox or Mucha (DE19503027) as applied to claims 1,3,4,6-10,13,15,16 above, and further in view of O'Connor ('951).

The difference between Bartels & Rieger as modified by Hubner and Wilcox or Mucha and claim 2 is plural filter/decontamination elements.

O'Connor, in a breathing apparatus, teaches plural filter/decontamination elements (11 and col.3, lines 30-42) for the purpose of increasing the filtering efficiency of the breathing device.

It would have been obvious to further modify the filter/decontamination element of Bartels & Rieger to include plural filter/decontamination elements because it would have increased the filtering efficiency of the breathing device as taught by O'Connor.

As to claims 11 and 12, O'Connor teaches the filter medium including a mesh and a vapor/gas filter medium (col.3, lines 33-35).

Claim 14 is substantially equivalent in scope to claim 2 and is included in Bartels & Rieger as further modified by O'Connor for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 2.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON J. LEWIS whose telephone number is (571) 272-4795. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM-6:00PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, HENRY A. BENNETT can be reached on (571) 272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


AARON J. LEWIS
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3743

Aaron J. Lewis
October 03, 2005